REMARKS

Claims 24-31 remain in this application, with Claims 1-23 cancelled. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and review of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the finality of the previous action as well as the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In the interest of expediting prosecution, the Applicants have cancelled all of the claims present in the application and have presented a new set of claims. No new matter has been added to the application.

The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of this claim.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Byford. The Examiner also rejected Claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Byford in view of Holtzman et al.; Claim 11 as unpatentable over Byford in view of Reber et al.; Claim 12 as unpatentable over Byford and Reber et al. and further in view of Knowles et al.; and, Claims 13 and 14 as unpatentable over Byford in view of Knowles et al. These rejections are now moot in view of the cancellation of these claim. New Claims 24-31 are deemed allowable over these references of record.

Byford discloses an apparatus and method for accessing a data file in a data communication network. Specifically, Byford discloses a wireless data communication network including a base station server computer 50, a plurality of wireless user terminals 70-90, and a plurality of tagging devices 100-130. The base station server computer 50 is also connected to the Internet 10, which is in turn connected to servers 20-40. The tagging devices 100-130 further include a data store 500 which contains a URL identifying one of the WWW pages stored on the servers 20-40 (see page 6, lines 11-17). When one of the wireless user terminals interrogates a tagging device, the user

terminal retrieves the URL stored in the data store and transfers the URL to the base station. In turn, the base station generates an appropriate request packet and retrieves the WWW page specified by the URL from the associated server via the Internet. The WWW page thus specified is then communicated to the user terminal for display to a user.

While there is a superficial similarity between Byford and the present invention insofar as both disclose a wireless network, the operations of the networks are substantially different. In an embodiment of the invention, a wireless network includes a server having a plurality of application programs operating thereon, a plurality of client computers connected to the server, and an RFID reader connected to the server. The RFID reader is adapted to communicate with a plurality of RFID tags each having a memory containing plural data fields for storage of data. The plural data fields include at least a first data field defining an address corresponding to either the server or one of the client computers, and a second data field identifying one of the plurality of application programs. The RFID reader scans an RFID tag to read the data loaded in the plural data fields, including the data loaded in the first and second data fields. The RFID reader then generates a data packet based on the data of the first and second data fields, and transmits the data packet to the address.

Unlike the present invention, the wireless user terminals of Byford do not generate a data packet based on address and application-type. Instead, the wireless user terminals read the URL and simply provide the URL to the server, which then retrieves a WWW page via the Internet and delivers that to the wireless user terminal. Hence, the Byford wireless user terminals have relatively little processing capability and rely upon the server to interpret the URL and communicate the appropriate information with the address defined by the URL. Moreover, Byford presents an application that is limited to delivering WWW pages at the wireless user terminals, and does not have an ability to utilize any of a plurality of application programs. Accordingly, the present invention provides substantially greater flexibility to the wireless network than Byford.

Particularly, Byford fails to suggest or disclose a computer network having an RFID reader adapted to perform the functions of:

detecting data loaded in said plural data fields of said memory of at least one of said plurality of RFID tags, wherein said plural fields include at least a first data field defining an address corresponding to either said server or one of said plurality of client computers, and a second data field identifying one of said plurality of application programs;

generating a data packet based on at least one of said first and second data fields; and

transmitting said data packet to said address

as now defined in Claim 24. This claim is therefore considered novel over Byford.

The other references of record fail to make up for the deficiencies of Byford. As discussed previously, Holtzman discloses a system and method of using a database application and data stored on an RFID tag to determine a user's access criteria to network information. Specifically, Holtzman discloses (i) retrieving unique identification information from an RFID tag, (ii) providing the received information to an external database application, (iii) using information stored on the external database application to determine the user's access criteria, and (iv) instructing a dispatch module to perform at least one action in accordance with the user's access criteria. Holtzman fails to suggest or disclose an RFID reader adapted to perform the functions defined in Claim 24.

Reber et al. discloses a method for navigating to a resource in an electronic network. The Examiner cites the reference merely for its disclosure that URL protocols include "mailto:" to identify a protocol for an email message. The reference otherwise fails to make up for the deficiencies of Byford and Holtzman discussed above.

Knowles et al. discloses a method for tracking objects bearing URL encoded bar code symbols. Each object has an assigned URL that specifies a static information storage location residing on a web page of a server. The reference otherwise fails to

make up for the deficiencies of Byford and Holtzman discussed above.

It is further noted that the Reber et al. and Knowles et al. seem to have no applicability to the RFID and wireless network arts. The references appear to be selected merely as part of a hindsight reconstruction of the invention, without any demonstration of a teaching or suggestion to form the proposed combination of references. Such a hindsight reconstruction is impermissible and should not form a proper basis for an obviousness rejection.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 24-31 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Applicants petition the Commissioner for a one-month extension of time, extending to April 16, 2004, the period for response to the Office Action dated December 16, 2003. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 16, 2004

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000